

HOPE VILLAGE OVERLAY DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

May 3, 2006

1) CALL TO ORDER -Chairman, Fred Faria called the meeting of the Hope Village Overlay District Review Committee (VDRC) to order on Wednesday, May 3, 2006 at 7:33 pm. The members who were present were Fred Faria, Dean Huff, Diana Hopkins, Michael Langlais.

2) Pre-application review of Hope Mill Village Project: INTRODUCTION: John Robinson (Project Architect), Dr. Madeline Robinson (Project Advisor), and Vincent R Coccoli (Real Estate Agent), presented to the committee their proposal using pictures and binder package containing description of the project proposal.

DISCUSSION: The following points were discussed with the committee:

\$ Property Boundaries: Mill is on 40 acres of land. The dam is part of the mill. The mill is on the Coventry/Scituate line. Area size: Front: 175,000 sq ft; Back 23,000 sq ft. - per developers.

\$ Municipal sewer : the abandoned railroad is proposed to be used to tie in the sewer lines. Possibility of tying into West Warwick's sewer plant- per developers.

\$ Water supply options: May locate water on side of the river, tie in to public utility or a well up on Hope Furnace Road - per developers.

\$ Owners: Mill has two owners - Mr. Izzy and Mr. Robert LaFerriera, though Mr. Coccoli noted for all intents and purposes he owns the property- per developers.

\$ Pedestrian Bridge: Hope Associates may participate in building a pedestrian bridge, Mill project to donate land to Hope Associates in exchange for use of the bridge/land- per developers.

\$ Tax Goal: Want to take advantage of tax credits and meet RI Historical Preservation & Heritage Commission recommendations. Market rate units are desired by the developer. (Minutes of the RIHPHC meeting were provided to the committee for reference).

\$ Museum: Project proposes to use the front part of the mill for Hydro and Industrial museum where water gears are located - per developers.

\$ Noise from the water mill concerns: use top floor and lower for mix/commercial use so residents will be buffered - per developers.

\$ DEM concerns: 100 year flood easement - they are OK. Set back is OK for wetlands- per developers.

\$ Fire escapes/balconies: are proposed and specific guidelines were provided by RI Historical Preservation Commission on how many, and where they could be located in front and back of mill. (Refers to #2 of RI Historic Preservation Letter).

\$ Garage in front of property: Another visit is planned to discuss use. It is historically significant. No dormers are allowed to be added. Project would like to use it as a single family residence. (200x300 ft). (Refers to #3 of RI Historic Preservation Letter).

\$ Sawtooth Roof concerns: Tower and other portions of the mill are more conducive to renovation. They want to have a courtyard in the

sawtooth area. The sub-basement may be used for underground parking but is too costly for now. The setback is 60 feet. Possibility of creating an atrium in this area. They also propose putting skylights on the back side of the sawtooth roof section - committee thought that would be acceptable. (Refers to #4 of RI Historic Preservation Letter).

\$ Hydroelectric capabilities: The river produces nine million gallons a day that they can use and they want to restore the mill's machinery to preserve the hydroelectric features. Possibility of using photovoltaic panels on the sawtooth roof for the tanks. Developers would also like to replicate the Gate House. (Refers to #14 of RI Historic Preservation Letter). Further discussion and approval needed from RHPHC regarding photovoltaic panels.

\$ Belfry: Project proposed to rebuild the belfry. The committee would like to see this happen.

\$ Number of Units: Luxury duplexes - 68 units (duplexes allowed) - they would be attached single family dwellings. Condominiums - 132 units. For credits, they could use as rental units or for mixed use. Possibility of doing some rentals over the commercial side of the mill (43,000 sq ft). Mixed use planned for eight units. The total unit count of 208, includes the three single family units proposed for the front of the mill. Pictures of existing single family dwellings were shown to the committee, however, it was discussed that the project not put the two proposed dwellings up on the front left side of the mill property, but in exchange, could make use of the right side garage and reconstruct the picking room for a family dwelling. This was an

acceptable consideration to developers. (Refers to #1 of RI Historic Preservation Letter).

\$ Front Canopy: Project would like to construct a front entrance canopy and will defer to the State for regulations.

\$ Other specific numbered points of the letter from the RI Historical Preservation & Heritage Commission to the Hope Village Mill Project were addressed:

\$ (#19, 20) Elevator: Committee concerns were discussed that the elevator should not protrude through the roof as this would detract from the historic character of the mill. Ramp for handicap access could be constructed in front below level, so as not to be visible from road side.

\$ (#13) Windows: The project proposes to replicate the windows and will follow true to what was there. Museum windows are to be an exact restoration. Insulated Aluminum units to match existing can be used. Recreation of delicate muntins and creating a true divided light was also discussed as well as all replacement windows must have an interior screen. Refers to RI Historic Preservation Letter).

\$ (#9) Sanborn Insurance Maps: The project will investigate Sanborn maps , as they often get Main Street in Fiskville mixed up with Main Street in Hope to address beam supports on the rear of the building.

\$ (#4) Atrium: 50 feet (40x40) A covered atrium is preferred.

\$ (#5) Parking: Front parking will be removed to allow better street view of the mill. Possibilities of landscaping for screening from road

view were discussed for other parking.

\$ Density - refer to Town ordinances.

\$ Propane Tanks: Project will remove the tanks- per developer.

\$ Fence: Replace with same, black in color. May use aluminum.

\$ Lighting: May incorporate same style period lighting as planned for Hope Village Lighting and Curbing project.

\$ Water Tower: Will leave open for now, further discussion will take place

\$ Walking bridge on the back side for pedestrian use was proposed- per developer.

\$ Zoning meetings to continue on points with town concerns.

3) GENERAL DISCUSSION – Discussion took place on the proposed “Hope Mill Village” project’s proposal. Fred Faria will fax punch list to David Provonsil.

4) MEMBERS COMMENTS – Dean Huff made a motion to approve the checklist from developers Robinson as discussed in this meeting, with provisional approval on returning to discuss further details and based on other town approvals. Diana Hopkins seconded the motion. All VRC committee members approved the motion. No opposing votes were offered.

5) PUBLIC COMMENTS - David Ellingwood voiced concerns on the “Hope Mill Village” project on village impact and Hope Associates cooperation.

6) ADJOURNMENT – The motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 pm was made by Dean Huff and seconded by Diana Hopkins. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,
Diana Hopkins, Vice President
May 31, 2006